**EXHIBIT A** 

Plaintiffs' websites TrafficSchool.com and DriverEdDirect.com and e. websites pointing to or from those sites, and goods and services provided therein. 3 4 26(a)(1)(C): COMPUTATION OF DAMAGES III. 5 Defendants' profits and any damages sustained by Plaintiffs recoverable under 6 15 U.S.C. § 1117 have not been computed at this time. Plaintiffs are awaiting discovery from Defendants on these issues. 8 9 DATED: April 12, 2007 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP 11 12 DAVID N. MAKOUS 13 MINA I. HAMILTON 14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs TRAFFICSCHOOL.COM, INC. and DRIVERS ED DIRECT, LLC 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 EXHIBIT A PAGE 27 28 4842-9246-1825.1 RULE 26 INITIAL DISCLOSURE BY PLAINTIFFS

**EXHIBIT B** 

## **Brian Daucher**

From:

MINA HAMILTON [HAMILTON@lbbslaw.com]

Sent:

Tuesday, September 25, 2007 9:55 AM

To:

Brian Daucher

Cc:

DAN DECARLO

Subject:

Fwd: Re: Damages

Attachments:

Text.htm; ATT1935960.gif





Text.htm (8 KB) ATT1935960.gif (409 B)

fyi

>>>

From: DAN DECARLO
To:Brian Daucher
Date: 9/21/2007 12:4

Date: 9/21/2007 12:12 PM Subject: Re: Damages

CC: Ashley Merlo; Joseph Tadros; MAKOUS, DAVID; MINA HAMILTON

## Brian:

I thought we were clear on this yesterday, but we have no problem providing you again our position. We will also note that this has been our position for the entirety of the case.

The Lanham Act provides for monetary remedies based upon the actual damages to our clients and the profits of your client. The Act (Sec 1117) states that for profits, "plaintiff shall be required to prove defendant's sales only; defendant must prove all elements of cost or deduction claimed." You have provided us with your gross sales and your purported offsets to those sales. As such, we intend to ask the jury for "damages" measured by the profits of your client per section of 1117.

I hope this is clear.

From: "Brian Daucher" <BDaucher@sheppardmullin.com>

To: "DAN DECARLO" < DECARLO@ 1bbslaw.com>

Date: 9/21/2007 10:50 AM

Subject: Damages

CC:"MINA HAMILTON" <HAMILTON@lbbslaw.com>, "Joseph Tadros" <JTadros@sheppardmullin.com>,
"Ashley Merlo" <AMerlo@sheppardmullin.com>

We really need an answer on this key question:

Are you seeking monetary recovery based upon proof of actual damage (eg, lost sales) to plaintiffs?

Yesterday, you seemed to indicate not, acknowledging the lack of any proof on this, but now the actual damage instruction, on how to assess plaintiffs' actual monetary damage, remains in place.

Defendants are entitled to a clear statement on this point. Thx,

Brian.

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP

Brian M. Daucher Partner Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP 650 Town Center Drive

EXHIBIT B PAGE 10

## , Case 2:06-cv-07561-PA-CW Document 194-2 Filed 11/20/07 Page 10 of 15 Page ID #:579

Fourth Floor
Costa Mesa, California 92626
bdaucher@sheppardmullin.com tel:
fax: (714) 424-2843
(714) 428-5925

Want to always have my latest info? Want a signature like this?

This message is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP Please visit our website at www.sheppardmullin.com

Daniel C. DeCarlo
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith
221 N. Figueroa St. Suite 1200
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012
213-680-5066
310-213-1732 (cell)
213-250-7900 (facsimile)
decarlo@lbbslaw.com (email)

EXHIBIT B PAGE 11

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BRIAN M. DAUCHER, Cal. Bar No. 1 ROBERT S. BEALL, Cal. Bar. No. 132 JOSEPH H. TADROS, Cal. Bar. No. 22 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & 1 A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional C orporations 650 Town Center Drive, 4th Floor Costa Mesa, California 92626-1925 Telephone: (714) 513-5100 Facsimile: (714) 513-5130 bdaucher@sheppardmullin.com jtadros@sheppardmullin.com Attorneys for Defendants EDRIVER, INC. and ONLINE GURU	2016 39379 HAMPTON LLP
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12		
13	TRAFFICSCHOOL.COM, INC., a	Case No. CV067561 The Hon. Percy Anderson
14	California corporation; DRIVERS ED DIRECT, LLC., a California limited liability company,	The Hon. I ercy Thuerson
15	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR
16	· V.	PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (SET ONE)
17 18 19 20	EDRIVER, INC., a California corporation; ONLINE GURU, INC., a California corporation; DOES 1 through 10.  Defendants.	Trial Date: October 30, 2007
21	REQUESTING PARTY: Plaint	iffs TRAFFICSCHOOL.COM, INC. and
22	-	TERS ED DIRECT, LLC ("Plaintiffs")
23		idants EDRIVER, INC. and ONLINE GURU,
24		("Defendants")
25	SET NO.: ONE	
26		
27 28		EXHIBIT C PAGE 12
	W00 WEST-NIA (1400200702 0	-1-
	W02-WEST:NA6\400299682.2	RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (SET ONE)

Defendants further object and will not produce documents responsive to this request to the extent that it seeks documents related to non-party, nonrespondents Find My Specialist and/or Serious Net. Defendants further object to this request on the grounds that it is burdensome, oppressive and harassing in that it is partially duplicative of request 11. Defendants object to this request on the grounds that it calls for information not relevant to the subject matter of the action nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request on the ground that it is burdensome and oppressive in that it is not a proper document request but is better suited as an interrogatory. Defendants further object on the grounds that Plaintiffs have no viable legal or equitable claim for damages in this case. Plaintiffs concede they will not seek their lost profits. In this light, it would be improper, prior to a liability finding on false advertising to force Defendants to turn over comprehensive financial information. 16 Defendants further object to this request to the extent that it seeks confidential and proprietary business and financial information. **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:** Federal & State tax returns for Your companies from the first use of 20 DMV.ORG to the present. **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:** 22 Pursuant to meet and confer, this request was withdrawn. 24 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18: Balance sheets and detailed Profit and Loss statements from the first use of DMV.ORG to the present, for any of the following: 26 (a) Online Guru, Inc.; EXHIBIT PAGE 13 eDriver, Inc.: (b)

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

19

21

23

25

27

28

Find My Specialist, Inc.; (c) 1 (d) Serious Net, Inc.; 2 DMV.ORG. (e) 3 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18: 4 Defendants object to this request on the grounds that it is overbroad, 5 burdensome and oppressive in that it is not reasonably limited in time or scope. Defendants further object to this request on the ground that it is 7 overbroad, burdensome and oppressive in that it seeks documents outside the scope of Plaintiffs' standing pursuant to the Court's orders of January 22, 2007 and March 15, 2007. 10 Defendants further object and will not produce documents responsive 11 to this request to the extent that it seeks documents related to non-party, non-12 respondents Find My Specialist and/or Serious Net. 13 Defendants further object to this request on the grounds that it is 14 burdensome, oppressive and harassing in that it is duplicative of No. 11. 15 Defendants object to this request on the grounds that it calls for 16 information not relevant to the subject matter of the action nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. 18 Defendants further object to this request on the ground that it is 19 burdensome and oppressive in that it is not a proper document request but is better 20 suited as an interrogatory. 21 Defendants further object to this request to the extent that it seeks 22 confidential and proprietary business and financial information. 23 Defendants further object on the grounds that Plaintiffs have no viable 24 legal or equitable claim for damages in this case. Plaintiffs concede they will not 25 seek their lost profits. In this light, it would be improper, prior to a liability finding 26 on false advertising to force Defendants to turn over comprehensive financial 27 EXHIBIT PAGE 14 information. 28

-19-

action alleged therein, is barred by the applicable statute of limitations." **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 60:** 2 Defendants object to this request to the extent that it requests 3 documents protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or work 4 product doctrine and/or other privacy rights. 5 Without waiving the foregoing, Defendants provide the following 6 7 response: Defendants will produce documents supporting their contentions to the 8 extent not already exchanged in initial disclosures. **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 61:** 10 All Documents supporting Your contention in paragraph 15 of Your 11 Answer to the First Amended Complaint that consumers were not misled. 12 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 61:** 13 Defendants object to this request to the extent that it requests 14 documents protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or work 15 product doctrine and/or other privacy rights. 16 Without waiving the foregoing, Defendants provide the following 17 18 response: Defendants will produce documents supporting their contentions to the 19 extent not already exchanged in initial disclosures. 20 DATED: June 1, 2007 21 22 SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP 23 Biran M. Dander / JAT 24 By 25 26 Attorneys for Defendants EDRIVER, INC. and ONLINE GURU, INC. EXHIBIT PAGE 15 27 28 W02-WEST:NA6\400299682.2